1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

2.0 21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE ABBOTT LABS NORVIR ANTITRUST LITIGATION,) No. C04-1511 CW (BZ) This Document Relates to All) FIFTH DISCOVERY ORDER Actions.

On August 8, 2007, I held a telephonic conference to discuss the discovery disputes outlined in the parties' August 1 and August 3 letters. All interested parties participated through counsel. The parties having agreed that no further briefing is required, I will treat defendant Abbott Laboratories's August 1 letter as constituting a motion to compel and a motion to alter export report disclosure dates. On that basis, and for the reasons discussed during the conference, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

1. On the representation by plaintiffs' counsel that their June 1, 2007 answers to defendant's interrogatories provided all factual information relating to the bases for its patent invalidity arguments known by plaintiffs (excluding information developed by plaintiffs' expert) at that time, the motion is **DENIED**. I understand that it may assist defendant to learn of the information plaintiffs' expert has developed as early as possible, but its remedy was to advance the expert disclosure dates, not to subvert the disclosure process with contention interrogatories.

2. Defendant's motion to order the plaintiffs to submit the initial expert report on the issue of the validity of defendant's patents is **DENIED**. This does not appear to be a discovery dispute but, rather, a dispute about who has the burden of establishing the invalidity of the patents at trial. While I expressed my views during the conference, I believe that this ultimately needs to be decided by Judge Wilken.

Dated: August 8, 2007

Bernard Zimmerman

United States Magistrate Judge

18 G:\BZALL\-REFS\DOE V.ABBOTT LABS\DISCOVERY ORDER.5.wpd

б